

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

VIRTAMOVE, CORP.,	§	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-CV-00093-JRG
	§	(LEAD CASE)
HEWLETT PACKARD ENTERPRISE	§	
COMPANY,	§	
<i>Defendant.</i>	§	
	§	

VIRTAMOVE, CORP.,	§	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-CV-00064-JRG
	§	(MEMBER CASE)
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS	§	
MACHINES CORP.,	§	
<i>Defendant.</i>	§	
	§	

ORDER

Before the Court is the Motion to Preclude and, in the Alternative, Compel Production of Documents and VirtaMove Witnesses for Deposition (the “Motion”) filed by Defendant Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company (“HPE”). (Dkt. No. 169.) In the Motion, HPE requests that the Court enter an order precluding Plaintiff VirtaMove, Corp. (“VirtaMove”) from relying on evidence from Mr. O’Leary, Mr. Huffman, and Mr. Woodward, and Mr. O’Connor (“VirtaMove’s Declarants”), or, alternatively, compelling VirtaMove to make all VirtaMove’s Declarants and their documents available without delay. (*Id.* at 1.)

After the filing of the Motion, HPE and VirtaMove (together, the “Parties”) filed a Joint Notice of Resolution of Motion Docket No. 169 (“Joint Notice”). (Dkt. No. 187.) In the Joint Notice, the Parties inform the Court that the “disputed issues . . . are resolved as to Mr. O’Leary, Mr. Woodward, Mr. O’Connor, and Mr. Huffman.” (*Id.* at 1.)

Having considered the Motion, the Response, and the Parties' Joint Notice of Resolution of Motion Docket No. 169, the Court finds that the Motion should be and hereby is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 14th day of May, 2025.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE